



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—DID PHILOCHORUS QUOTE THE ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ AS ARISTOTLE'S?

"Whether the original treatise [i. e. the original edition of the recently discovered 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία] was by Aristotle, or by an immediate pupil, as Rose has maintained, is quite another question. It can be proved, however, we believe—though this is not the place to do it—that the historian Philochorus, writing before B. C. 306,¹ or less than twenty years after the composition of the work, quoted it as Aristotle's,² sometimes to supplement, some-

¹ Philochorus held the office of *ἱεροσκόπος* Ol. 118, 3, B. C. 306 (Müller, F. H. G. I, p. 403, Frag. 146=Dion. Hal., Din. 3, 637)—i. e. was in middle life—and was put to death B. C. 261 (Suid. s. v.) after a long life of enormous literary activity spent at Athens. Of the seventeen books of his *Atthis*, books I–VI were apparently issued first, as a complete work (*πρὸς τὴν Δῆμῳνος Ἀτθίδα, ἢ πρὸς Δῆμωνα ἀντιγραφὴ*), and must have preceded the others by some time (Boeckh, Kl. Schriften, V, p. 429). Book VI, however, contains words that imply a reference to twelve Athenian tribes (Frag. 130 b: *Δημητριάς* and *Ἀντιγονίς*), and therefore could not have been written before 307 B. C. Philochorus must have been engaged upon the *Atthis* in the prime of his powers. His *ἐπιτομή τῆς ἰδίας Ἀτθίδος* presupposes the completion of the whole work some considerable time before his death.

² Rose, who had only the fragments upon which to build, has already suggested that Philochorus knew the *Respub. Ath.*, but he ascribes the *Πολιτεία*, not to Aristotle, but to Demetrius Phalereus. "Huius [Dem. Phal.] igitur opus Aristotelis nomine inscriptum Timaeus legit, idem probabile est iam novisse Philochorum," Aristot. *Pseudepigr.* p. 398. Rose's reasons for thus assigning the authorship are the following: the constitution of Athens described in some of the fragments appears to be more aristocratic in character than that prevalent before about 317 B. C.; on the other hand, the fragments show that the work was composed before the ten tribes were increased to twelve (B. C. 307). "Quae vero vestigia pauca occurrunt (cf. fr. 31 [=Aristot. *Fragg.* 414], 85 [= *ibid.* 469]), quibus rempublicam qualis erat post Euclidem, in aristocraticam magis speciem mutatum fuisse credas, ea quoque plane conveniunt Demetrii Phalerei temporis quo politiarum auctorem sive Atheniensem sive Athenis commoratum scripsisse vidimus, scilicet Ol. 116 vel 117 (inter Ol. 115, 3—118, 2)," Rose, *ibid.* p. 398. His first inference, however, was based on insufficient data and is not borne out by the complete text of the original work; on the other hand, internal evidence conclusively shows that the work was composed not only before 307 B. C., but certainly not later than 324 B. C., i. e. before the death of Aristotle. Schvarcz (*Ungarische Rev.*, 1891, April) has lately revived Rose's view of the Demetrian authorship of the *Respub. Ath.*, but hardly with success.

times to controvert its statements."—The Nation, May 7, 1891, No. 1349, p. 382.

I purpose here to present in brief the reasons that caused me to write the foregoing sentences: viz. to show that the Aristotelian authorship of the *Respublica Atheniensium* was acknowledged by Philochorus.

I. It is perfectly safe to infer from many of the fragments of his *Atthis* that Philochorus frequently quoted from earlier historical writers and authorities. As examples *Fragg.* 128, 152, 96, 40 (Müller, F. H. G., I, p. 391, ff.) may be adduced. In *Frag.* 128 (Harpoc., s. *Στρυμῆ*), we read that Philochorus cited Archilochus as authority for his remarks about the island Stryme. In *Frag.* 152 (Harpoc., s. *ἀμπιποι*) Philochorus appears to be citing the views of Thucydides and Xenophon, and to be giving a fuller explanation of the word in question;¹ possibly he had also in mind *Respub. Ath.* (ed. Kenyon) c. 49, p. 122, l. 24 (for Kenyon's *ἀνίππους* read, with Blass, *ἀμύππους*). In *Frag.* 96 (Harpoc., s. *Δύκειον*) is not Philochorus correcting, while he quotes, the historian Theopompus? Perhaps doubt may attach to some of the preceding as examples,—hardly, however, to the following. In *Frag.* 40 (Plut. *Thes.* 19) Philochorus quotes and controverts Demo: indeed, the first six books of the *Atthis* bore the alternative title *ἡ πρὸς Δήμωνα ἀντιγραφὴ* (Harpoc. s. *Ἡετιωνεία*, Suid. s. *τριτοπάτορες*), and contained many criticisms of Demo's views. But above all Philochorus appears to have made abundant references to the *Atthis* of Androtrion, instances of which need not here be adduced.² It is universally admitted that the *Atthid*-writers in general freely quoted and criticised each other.

II. There are, accordingly, sufficient *a priori* grounds for supposing that the *Respub. Ath.*—demonstrably composed before B. C. 324, and doubtless published at once—would have been quoted by Philochorus, especially if it was the work of Aristotle. The historical sketch of an obscure writer so near his own day he would probably have made little use of. In the following frag-

¹ The *μήποτε* here, however,—a mark of the style of Didymus—suggests that it may have been after all only Didymus that combined these citations and suggested the fuller explanation.

² "Von seinen Vorgängern hat Philochorus sicherlich die *Atthis* des Androtrion stark benutzt. Oefter werden gerade Philochorus und Androtrion zusammen citirt. Vgl. *Fragm.* 59, 120, 130 a, 133, 150, 153." Busolt, *Griech. Geschichte*, I, pp. 365, 366 and note.

ments I think we are obliged to see examples of quotation, although it must be admitted that the coincidences may in part be otherwise accounted for. In Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1223 (cf. Schol. Lys. 58) we have a Didymean quotation from Philochorus. Though the name of Philochorus is not given, a comparison of the subject-matter of Schol. Lys. 58 and the last part of Schol. Vesp. 1223 with the language of Strabo IX 392 C., where Philochorus is named as the authority, proves conclusively the Philochorean origin of this scholium.¹ Now in this scholium is imbedded a slightly abbreviated quotation from Respub. Ath. c. 13, pp. 35, l. 9—36, l. 6. The form of the introductory words (*κατὰ τοὺς Σόλωνος χρόνους*—Codd. *νόμους*) is distinctly Philochorean, and shows that Didymus is here quoting only Philochorus, with Aristotle at second-hand, and not the two writers coördinately, i. e. Schol. Vesp. 1223 = Didymus (Philochorus [Aristotle]), not = Didymus (Philochorus + Aristotle + Philochorus). Further, in Frag. 57 (Suid. s. *σεισάχθεια*) one can hardly fail to see in Philochorus's *ἀποψηφισθῆναι τὸ ἄχθος* an intended correction or explanation of *ἀποσεΐσαμενοι τὸ βάρος* in Respub. Ath. c. 6, p. 15, l. 17, here worded *τὸ ἄχθος ἀποσεΐσασθαι*. And in Frag. 58 (St. Maximus, prol. in S. Dionysii Areop. Opera, Vol. II, pp. ix, x: ed. 1776), the words *οἱ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις πρωτεύοντες ἐν τε γένει καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ βίῳ χρηστῶ*, apparently ascribed to Philochorus,² are strikingly like the *ἡ γὰρ αἵρεσις τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην ἦν ἐξ ὧν οἱ Ἀρεοπαγίται καθίσταντο* of Respub. Ath. c. 3 *ad fin.* The coincidences between Fragg. 67, 68 (*ἀδύνατοι*) and 101 and Respub. Ath. c. 49, p. 124, and c. 53, p. 130 foot, where Philochorus treats of the same subject with Aristotle, may be otherwise accounted for. And the resemblances between Fragg. 65 and Respub. Ath. c. 7, p. 17, l. 3; between 122 and Respub. Ath. c. 29, p. 81, ll. 4 ff.; between 118 and Respub. Ath. c. 34, p. 92, l. 1—cited, with most of the foregoing, by W. L. Newman, in the Classical Review, Vol. V, p. 158

¹ Meiners (Diss. Halens. XI, pp. 364–366) has shown the Philochorean character of Schol. Lys. 58, and of the latter part of Schol. Vesp. 1223. This new fragment of Philochorus should be inserted in Müller, F. H. G., I, probably between Fragg. 65 and 66, and not—since it begins with *κατὰ τοὺς Σόλωνος χρόνους*—as Meiners would place it, after Frag. 35.

² Though the name of Androtion is cited as an authority for a statement occurring in this work between these words and the place where Philochorus is named, the substance of this sentence repeated at the latter place is given as Philochorus's, and we are safe in inferring that the words quoted above are traceable to Philochorus.

(March, 1891)—are too remote to serve as certain examples of direct quotation.¹

III. The examples that we have thus far considered, doubtful though some of them may be, show, as a whole, two things: first, that it is quite certain that Philochorus quoted from the *Respub. Ath.*, and, second, that it is highly probable that he named the author of his quotations. It is likely that the number of examples of a connexion between these two writers will be discovered to be much larger, now that we have in the complete text of the *Respub. Ath.* a new touchstone to apply, in the examination of the later and derived literature.

But is it possible to change the proposition that Philochorus named Aristotle, from a probability into a certainty? It seems to me that the demonstration desired may be found in the inferences that we are obliged to draw from the language of *Plut. Them.* 10 (cf. *Cat.* 5), and *Aelian, De Nat. Anim.* 12, 35 (see *Rose, Aristot. Fragg.* 398, 399). In *Plut. Them.* 10 a long account is given of certain events immediately preceding the battle of Salamis. We are told that Themistocles, making use of divine portents and oracular utterances, prevailed upon the Athenian folk to pass a decree committing their city to Athena, directing the men of military age to embark upon the triremes, and women, children and slaves to save themselves as best they could. Aristotle is cited as authority for the statement that the Areopagus, in the lack of public funds, provided each soldier with eight drachmae, and thereby filled the ships-of-war.² Cleidemus is next quoted as asserting

¹ In *Frag.* 79 b there are several subjects that occur in the *Respub. Ath.*—time of *ὁστρακοφορία*, regulation limiting the residence of ostracised persons, origin of the custom (cc. 44, 22 *ad fin.*, 22 *ad med.*)—but, although the phraseology is, at least on the last point, almost identical in the two writers, the different order in which the subjects come up suggests that both are drawing from a common source, each framing his narrative to suit himself, rather than that Philochorus is quoting from Aristotle. Perhaps this explanation is the correct one for coincidences in some of the other doubtful passages mentioned above. F. Cauer, *Hat Aristoteles die Schrift vom Staat der Athener geschrieben?* pp. 37, 38, calls attention to *Fragg.* 17 [*Respub. Ath.* c. 8, p. 24, on the competency of the Areopagus], and 33 [*Respub. Ath.* c. 3, p. 5, on Ion], with 79, as proofs that the writer of the *Respub. Ath.* and Philochorus were drawing from the same source.

² *Plut. Them.* 10: οὐκ ὄντων δὲ δημοσίων χρημάτων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, Ἀριστοτέλης μὲν φησι τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν πορίσασαν ὀκτὼ δραχμὰς ἐκάστω τῶν στρατευομένων αἰτιωτάτην γενέσθαι τοῦ πληρωθῆναι τὰς τριήρεις. Cf. *Respub. Ath.* c. 23: τῶν γὰρ στρατηγῶν ἐξαπορησάντων τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ κηρυξάντων σφῆξεν ἕκαστον ἐαυτὸν πορίσασα δραχμὰς ἐκάστω ὀκτὼ δέδωκε [*sc. ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴ*] καὶ ἐνεβίβασεν εἰς τὰς ναῦς.

that this action also was due to the wiles of Themistocles. Then follows a pathetic account of the departure of the people from their homes, in which the story is told of the dog of Xanthippus, father of Pericles, which swam by the side of its master's trireme across the strait to Salamis, but died of exhaustion on reaching the further shore, where in later times its grave was pointed out (*Κυνὸς σῆμα*). In Plut. Cat. 5 there is a reference to the instance of the dog of Xanthippus and his burial-place. In neither of these accounts does Plutarch give us his authorities for this episode. Fortunately, however, in Aelian, *De Nat. Anim.* 12, 35, the story recurs in part, as an illustration of the devotion of dogs to their masters, and the excerpt concludes with the significant words *λέγεται δὲ ἄρα ταῦτα Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Φιλόχορος*. The general resemblance between Plutarch's and Aelian's forms of the narrative, though not closely verbal, is marked enough to make it certain that the two accounts are traceable to the same original. The lack of close resemblance shows that one of the narratives is one or two degrees further removed from the original than the other; the remoter one in this case is probably Aelian's,¹ who takes his facts at second-hand much oftener than Plutarch.² The resemblance between the two accounts begins

¹ The sources of Aelian's *De Nat. Anim.* have not yet been satisfactorily explored. For the *Var. Hist.* we have Rudolph's careful study (Leipzig. Stud. VII, pp. 1-138), in which are a few remarks on the *De Nat. Anim.* (pp. 86, 134-137). Of course Favorinus (*Παντοδαπὴ Ἱστορία*) was Aelian's great mine, but he had also other sources. In the *Var. Hist.* there are many citations from Attic writers, but they are not original citations (Rudolph, p. 35). Now, in the *De Nat. Anim.*, Aelian quotes (at second or third hand) from Aristotle *De Anim.* (Rose, *A. P.*, pp. 276 ff.). It appears that Asinius Pollio, of Tralles, wrote on Aristotle *De Anim.*, as also an *ἐπιτομή* of Philochorus (Suid., s. *Πολίων ὁ Ἀσίνιος*). Doubtless Aelian was familiar with the writings of this author, whose professional career was passed in Rome. Many of the Aristotelian quotations may have been taken from the Commentary, and the extract from Philochorus from the *ἐπιτομή*. But this is wholly conjectural. Rose and Rudolph would probably maintain that Aelian's relation to Aristotle (and to Philochorus) was yet more remote: *Aristotelica* — Aristophanes Byz. — Didymus — Pamphilus (*Λεγιών*) — Favorinus (*Παντοδαπὴ Ἱστορία*) — Aelian. Wellmann (*De Istro Callimachio*, p. 7) contends that the story of Alcmena aided by a weasel (*γαλῆ*) in Aelian, *Var. Hist.* 12, p. 426, is traceable through Alexander Myndius to Ister. This would suggest for the dog story the following transmission: Philochorus — Ister — Alexander Myndius — Aelian.

² In Aelian's *Ξανθίππου τοῦ Ἀρίφρονος* (cf. *Respub. Ath.* c. 22) — as, perhaps, also in other turns — we have, however, the survival of an earlier form of statement than the *Ξανθίππου τοῦ Περικλέους πατρὸς* of Plutarch.

back at Plutarch's words about *σημεῖα δαιμόνια* and *χρησμούς*—expressions, it should be noted, that precede the mention of the names of Aristotle and Cleidemus. Aelian, as we have seen, informs us that the facts stated by him are mentioned by Aristotle and Philochorus. The Respub. Ath. does not, however, in its present form, give the incident about the dog—though what Plutarch quoted is there given—and there is no reason to believe that it ever was in the work. And, under the circumstances, to suppose that the story occurred in some other work of Aristotle,¹ raises more difficulties than it solves. There can, however, be no doubt of the truth of Aelian's statement that the story was found in Philochorus; the story is of a sort that Philochorus would be likely to relate,² and, furthermore, Philochorus is an extremely frequent source for Plutarch.³ We are accordingly safe in inferring that Philochorus was at least one of Plutarch's sources for the passage cited from the Them., and doubtless an immediate source. How, then, are we to account for the mention of the name of Aristotle by Aelian? The most probable answer to this question seems to me to be the following: Aelian, or his source, had read an extract from Philochorus concerning the events preceding the battle of Salamis, in which the name of Aristotle occurred, only a

¹ "Fieri potest ut in zoico quodam libro haec dixerit Aristoteles, sicut in Hist. An. Z 24 mulum ab Atheniensibus immunitatum donatum commemorat: cuius Plutarchus in eodem capite Catonis cum cane Xanthippi meminit. sed fortasse omnino erravit de Aristotele Aelianus. de Philochoro verum dicit: nam in Themistocle ex Atthide pendet Plutarchus." Kaibel-Wilamowitz, Aristotelis *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, p. 92.

² Cf. Frag. 146, from the Atthis, book IX (Dion. Hal., Din. 3, 637) about the dog that visited the Acropolis, and finally lay down on the altar of Zeus Herceus. It was to explain this portent that Philochorus was called upon as *ἱεροσκόπος*. That the Atthis abounded in odd information a cursory examination of the fragments at once reveals.

³ Plutarch's citations from Philochorus are occasionally made at first-hand, though sometimes through Ister. Gilbert's assumption that in the Theseus, where the traces of Philochorus are most numerous, Plutarch drew wholly—except cc. 1, 2—from Ister's *Συναγωγή* (Philol. 33, pp. 46 ff.) has been shown to be faulty by Wellmann (De Istro Callimachio, pp. 19 ff.). The latter writer demonstrates that though Ister is abundantly used, it is equally clear that Philochorus is now and then presented by Plutarch in a purer form than we find him in Ister, i. e. in his original form (e. g., according to Wellmann, the narratives in Thes. cc. 14, 16, 19, perhaps 24, also 31, 35, 36). For other remarks on Philochorus as a source for Plutarch, see Harvard Studies, III, pp. 26, 27, and notes.

short space above the account of the dog,—the matter that had mainly attracted Aelian's attention—and, by a blunder natural in rapid reading, Aelian (or his source) inferred that Aristotle in the quotation, as well as Philochorus, had told the story of the dog. Perhaps the mistake was made in Aelian's source, which, however, perpetuated the name of Philochorus as author of the extract; but it could hardly have been made if Aristotle's name had not occurred in Philochorus's account. We cannot, accordingly, escape the inference that Philochorus quoted Aristotle by name, and it is highly probable that in this passage from Plut. Them. 10, we have essentially, from the beginning to the end, the extract—quotations and all, here somewhat paraphrased and expanded—which, under the name of Philochorus as author, and greatly reduced in bulk, retaining, however, the name of Aristotle, lay before Aelian's authority.¹

The most obvious objection that will be raised to our inference will be of this nature: Plutarch, it will be said, may have been quoting from Philochorus for a part of his narrative, but the reference to Aristotle was not in the original Philochorus passage; it was inserted by Plutarch. To this objection two answers should be made: (1) Aelian's use of Aristotle's name remains unaccounted for; (2) Plutarch was not in the habit of quoting the Respub. Ath. at first-hand.² Indeed, one may incidentally remark, had Plu-

¹ If our reasoning be sound, we have in this passage a new fragment for Philochorus. It should be inserted in Müller, F. H. G., I, just before Frag. 84, which forms its conclusion.

² There is, of course, no *a priori* reason why Plutarch should not have consulted the Respub. Ath. at first-hand, nor why he might not have had the book in his library. The Berlin papyrus, the copy recently discovered, the entry in the catalogue of an Egyptian library of the third century A. D. (Zündel, Rhein. Mus. 1866, p. 432, quoted by Rose, Aristot. Fragg., p. 260), besides other indications, show that copies of this treatise were current after the Christian era. But an examination of Plut. Solon and Pericles, where the traces of Aristotle are most marked, convinces me that in the composition at least of these Lives Plutarch took his Aristotle at second-hand. Between the Sol. and the Respub. Ath. there is a vast number of coincidences at more than forty points; there are, on the other hand, not a few statements in Plutarch's narrative at variance with the distinct language of unquoted parts of the Respub. Ath. Now those who maintain that Plutarch read his Respub. Ath. at first-hand will explain the discrepancies on the theory that Plutarch merely dipped in here and there, without carefully reading the whole work, and picked out various statements which he then wrought into the framework of his own narrative, without taking thought whether this was quite consistent with other statements of his author: the

tarch been reading the original Respub. Ath. at the time he was writing his Them. he could not have failed to introduce the highly characteristic anecdote of his hero, found only a few lines further down, which tells of the intrigue of Themistocles whereby Ephialtes was brought face to face with the Areopagus.

The bearing of the inference that we have drawn, if a sound inference from certain data, upon the question of the authorship of the Respub. Ath. is very important. The testimony that it affords on the point is the earliest yet adduced; even Timaeus's testimony as to the *Πολιτεία* touches strictly only the Respub. Locr.¹ If Philochorus, the careful historical student and critic,

discrepancies, thus, are due to his not having carefully read the original work. This explanation, however, is unsatisfactory. The large number of coincidences, and the nature of these coincidences, show that the work from which Plutarch was quoting was very familiar to him, in framework and in substance, down to the minutest details. Hence, since he makes assertions that are contradictory of the Respub. Ath. in its original form, the work read by him cannot have been the Respub. Ath. in its original form. It must have been an abridgment, in which many important passages were omitted—such as the account of the Draconian constitution, the story of Themistocles, Ephialtes and the Areopagus, etc.—as well as numerous minor remarks (see Harvard Studies, III, p. 25, note 3).

I do not deny that another hypothesis can be suggested in explanation of the various phenomena, viz. that Plutarch's was the original work, not an abridgment, while the newly discovered treatise is not the original one at all, but rather a derived copy highly inflated and abounding with interpolations. Unfortunately, however, for this theory, alike the literary form of the present work, and the fact that passages at variance with Plutarch's statements are quoted as from the Respub. Ath. in the Fragments, point to the conclusion, first, that the present treatise (Brit. Mus. Papyrus, No. CXXXI) is before us in its original form, and, secondly, that in its substance it was more extensive than the book carefully studied by Plutarch.

If, then, in Sol. and Per., Plutarch took his Aristotle at second-hand, it is highly probable that in the Thes. he did the same. The absence of this part of the Respub. Ath. from the copy recently discovered, i. e. the account of earliest Attic history, makes it impossible to speak definitively on this point. One might, however, suggest that the information in Plut. Thes. 25 as to *ἐνπατρίδαι, γεωγράφοι, δημιουργοί*, said to be derived from Aristotle, is given us in a form distinctly more secondary than that in Lex. Patm. Demosth., p. 152 (Sakkellion), Schol. Plat. Axioch., 371 D: Rose, Fragg. Nos. 384, 385. See my remarks on *ἐνπατρίδαι* in Harvard Studies, III, p. 43, note.

¹ Cf. Polyb. exc. XII 5, 6, 8 and 11; Athen. VI 264 C and 272 A (Rose, A. P., pp. 496-498). Some of Timaeus's comments on Aristotle, which Polybius controverts, recall not a few of the criticisms passed of late on the Respub. Ath. by those who deny to it Aristotelian authorship, a form of skepticism which it did not occur to Timaeus to adopt.

who lived and wrote at Athens in the generation immediately following Aristotle's, looked upon the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία as Aristotle's, should we hesitate so to do? Ought we not—if need be—to discard our previous conception of Aristotle's literary characteristics and mental habits for a larger and more catholic conception, rather than accept the highly improbable alternative that Philochorus was deceived?

J. H. WRIGHT.